



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FRANCO-ITALIAN *CHEVALERIE OGIER*

III. NOTES

The time is ripe for a systematic study of the language of the compilation contained in MS XIII of the San Marco library. The inedited portions should be published and an extensive glossary of the whole prepared. It is this task that I had assumed, but I have recently learned that the work has already been undertaken and I withdraw. I hope my colleague may find some assistance in these notes.

2. *in até*; this expression I understand to be an extension of the use of the word *eté*, *até* AETATEM in such phrases as *viver in eté* 285, *viver en aie* 971; cf. *Mac.*, 3492: *La festa dure .XV. jor en avan*. I have not been able to find a case strictly parallel to the one in question. In our MS *m* and *in* can rarely be distinguished with absolute certainty; hence we may read here *maté*. So far as I can discover this makes no sense: the Milanese *temp matt* = *stravagante* (Arrighi, *Diz. Mil.-Ital.*, Milan, 1896) and the corresponding French expression are not to the point.

Rubric after 14. *Marmore* is Verona; see Crescini, *Il Cantare di Fiorio e Biancifiore*, Bologna, 1889, I, 163, II, 10, 239 f. and the references there given. Rajna's promise of a study on the geography of the French *Ogier* (*Arch. stor. ital.*, S. IV, Vol. XIX, 1887, p. 45, n. 5), in which doubtless the Italian versions will be considered, is reiterated by him in *Studi medievali*, III, 1910, p. 385.

conmença; *con-* like *in-* retained intact, as in many documents of the vulgar tongues, through influence of mediaeval Latin orthography; cf. Parducci in *Studj romanzi*, I, p. 97, and his reference to Rajna's *De vulg. Eloq.*; Parodi, *Tristano riccardiano*, Bologna, 1896, p. cxxxii; also above, p. 2.

32. *nen* (MS *non*); a combination of French (and Venetian, see Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, III, p. 265) *en* and Italian *ne*, according to Mussafia, *Berta*, 591, n. The word is rare, perhaps because a mere omission of the stroke over the *e* (abbreviation for *n*) results in the commoner *ne*. I have noted the following examples of *nen*: *Berta*, 591, 1129, 1615; *Mac.*, 2110, 2845; cf. here, 673, 1188; *Karleto* of our MS, vs. 8 of extract by Guessard, *Bibl. Ecole Chartes*, 1857, p. 398 (MS has *ven*, i.e., *v'en*, according to Mussafia, *Handschriftl. Studien*, Vienna, 1863, p. 310). Examples that I have noted outside of our MS may be errors: *Rainardo e Lesengrino*, 437, ed. Teza, Pisa, 1869, reprinted in Martin, *Renart*, Strasbourg, 1882, II, pp. 358 ff. (perhaps *nen* here = *ne* [i.e., *ci*] + *ne* as, e.g., in Wiese, *Allomb. Marg. Leg.*, Halle, 1890, v. 174); Franco-511]

Italian *Hector*, extract by Meyer in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, X, p. 402, § 22 (one MS); Bertoni, *Attila*, Friburg, 1907, extract I, 292, 395 (fairly sure examples). Similarly in the Franco-Italian *Aspremont* (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, X, p. 49) Meyer considers *io* a contamination of French *ie* and Northern Italian *eo*, rather than the Tuscan *io*. *Io*, however, occurs in northern Italian texts where there is no reason to suspect foreign influence; cf., e.g., Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, III, p. 263 (*Cronica venez.*). Remembering Ascoli's warning (*Arch. glott.*, I, especially pp. 451 ff.) not to exaggerate the French influence even in Franco-Italian texts, it is perhaps better to consider *en* which enters into the composition of *nen* Venetian and not French, and *io* indigenous Venetian.

47. *apendu*; see note to 1913.

Rubric after 57. The strange forms assumed by the word *Danois* in the rubrics are noteworthy: *Donis* (here), *Donois* (after 98, 318; *Enf. Og.* after 550), *Donois* (after 796), *da Rois* (after 856), *Dainos* (after 2050). These are to be corrected wherever they are not supported by similar forms in the text. The first syllable may be *Dai-* as in 58, 842, etc., and in Old Italian generally. *Donois* is to be corrected to *Danois* and perhaps to *Danois* (but cf. *Enf. Og.*, 287 *Daynesin*, 505, 535 *Daineseto*). The *e* for *oi* of the last-named forms is due to the Italian *Dainese* (cf. *Dainès*, *Enf. Og.*, 486). *Dainos* I correct to *Dainois* despite *Dainos*, *Enf. Og.*, 531, which seems to be a scribal error. Perhaps the MS actually reads *Daines*: for difficulty in distinguishing *e* and *o*, see note to 545. Little importance is to be attached to forms which appear in the rubrics exclusively, for these are very carelessly written. Occasional omissions of the rubrics and the practice of scribes of postponing the writing of those passages for which black ink was not used prove that the rubrics were inserted after the completion of the MS. The great ignorance of the subject-matter of the poems shown by the writer, and such errors as those under discussion, indicate that the rubrics are due to a second, inferior scribe. It is probable that they did not exist in the original MS. Cf. Keller, *Romvart*, Mannheim-Paris, 1844, pp. 42, 45, 47; Guessard, *Bibl. Ecole Chartes*, 1857, p. 395.

94. MS has *doe mon amor*, which might be read *dòe* (cf. *òe* here, 451, and *Mac.*, 3148) with the familiar Italian epithetic *e*; or *do e'* = *do eo*.

102. *el ne porta la mançe*; cf. *Enf. Og.*, 225. Note the rhyme; cf. Ital. *mancia*.

133. *darie* = *doré* *DAURATUM, form due to the rhyme; no connection with *orie* of the Roland. I have not corrected to *dorie* but cannot defend the *a*. For Latin *-alt* > *-at* see note to 1762. For localities where under certain circumstances Latin *-au* > *-a* (type AGUSTUS naturally excluded), see Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Lang. rom.*, I, § 287; Ascoli in *Arch. glott.*, I, pp. 50, § 93; 271, § 68; de Gregorio, *ibid.*, VIII, p. 309; Morosi, *ibid.*, p. 414; Pieri, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XXVIII, p. 163. The treatment in San Fratello is probably due to Sicilian influence, for in Sicily a similar development takes place (see Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, I, § 354) and is not the reflection of a northern

dialectal peculiarity. Isolated examples in texts of our region: Bertoni, *Attila*, p. liii (*ator*); Lindner, *Plainte de la Vierge*, Upsala, 1898, p. lv (*ristaro*, MS B), are probably errors. *Ar coito* in *Ber. e Mil.*, 241, rightly corrected by Mussafia, is worth noting.

137. *Baiver*; always so spelled in this MS.

162. *Besgore* is Brescia; see Rajna, *Romania*, III, p. 50.

168. *La ville guarda*. This correction is not satisfactory since it is too far from the MS reading: *E l ui lega*. The first letter of a verse is always separated from the second; hence *El*. An incorrect division which left *vi* by itself I take to be the cause of the corruption. The scribe understanding *vi*=*vidit* changed *la* to *el*. For *guarda*, cf. 620; I do not read *garda* in my correction because the word seems always to be spelled *gua-* in our MS. Perhaps some noun unknown to me is hidden under the form *ga*, but *le* is masculine and *la* in the next verse requires a feminine in this. The suggestion for my correction I derived from *Prise de Pampelune*, 5707, ed. Mussafia, Vienna, 1864:

E esgarda la ville e davant e dariere.

Cf. here v. 620. *Terre* meaning a fortified city (here=*ville*) needs no comment. Possibly: *El vi[V] e guarda* or *El vi[V] loga*.

169. *laoer*. The correction to *à loer* is slight but inadvisable considering the wide-spread development *au*>*ao*; e.g., *laodara*, Tobler, *Proverbia* (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX), 3d; *caosa*, *ibid.*, 17b *et passim*; *ao* AUT, *ibid.*, 157c; *caosa* Tobler, *Panfilo* (*Arch. glott.*, X), 5 *et passim*; *ao*, *ibid.*, 65 *et passim*; Tobler, *Cato*, Berlin, 1883, p. 12; Tobler, *Uguçon*, Berlin, 1884, p. 12, etc. Cf. Caix, *Origini*, Florence, 1880, p. 98.

173-74. A negative (which would perfect the measure of the verse) is expected before *pouist*; but cf. Franco-Italian *Aliscans*:

*S'à chascun colp en feisés . C. morir,
Encois verois un mois tot complir
Q'il fusesent mort.*

—Keller, *Romvart*, p. 35, vss. 17-19.

Cf. Franco-Italian *Aspremont*, 180-81, in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, X, p. 28; *Ber. e Mil.*, 410, and Mussafia's note; Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I², 1902, p. 133.

176. *Verçilio*; cf. Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, English translation (1895), pp. 322-23; German translation (1875), p. 274.

187. *Un Çarle el maine*; so *un Macario*, *Mac.*, 1825; *un Cantacler*, *Rainardo e Lesengrino*, 33, 299, ed. Teza.

214. *apis*<*ape(N)sum*; cf. *apeso* 245. A common type, due to *umlaut* in the perfect; cf. Bertoni, *Attila*; *intis* (*INTENDERE*), extr. III, 25, VI, 104, etc.; Lorck, *Alibergamaskische Sprachdenkmäler*, Halle, 1893, p. 60; Mussafia, *Prise de Pampelune*, p. xiii; similar forms occur everywhere in our region.

274. *la ploça e la rosé*. The constant association of *ploça* and *rosé* in many texts suggests the correction to *rosé* of the word *nosé* which disturbs Mussafia in *Orl.*, 453.

279. I read *tu i* (= *IBI*) *ten* which is perfectly intelligible. Perhaps it is better to suppress *i* or read *tui* (= *tu*). *Tui* in Venetian territory seems to be a possible analogical form of the pronoun (cf. *vui*, *lu lui*, etc.), but I have not been able to find evidence of such a form in our region. Perhaps *tue* (= *tu* + epithetic *e*) > *tui* as Meyer-Lübke suggests for the Sardinian *tui* (*Ital. Gram.*, p. 209). *Tue* occurs in northern texts, e.g., *Rainardo e Lesengrino*, 650, 673, etc., ed. Teza.

294. *que[l]*; I add *l* here despite the fact that in certain Northern dialects final *l* falls; see references in Wiese, *Altital. Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, 1904, p. 100. There are many examples of this fall in our MS; cf. *Mac.*, 600, note. For *que* = *quel*, see Salvioni in *Arch. glott.*, XIV, p. 229, § 36.

299. *faroie*; in our MS and other texts the conditional forms are frequently used, in the singular, for the future. The confusion is not syntactical (cf. Ebeling in *Abhandlungen . . . Tobler . . . dargebracht*, Halle, 1895, p. 346) but probably has its source in the forms *oit*, *ait* = HABET; cf. Mussafia, *Mac.*, p. xiii.

300. *to[i]*; there is no evidence to support *to*, *toi* parallel with *lu*, *lui*. Subák rightly corrects *so* to *soi*, *Enf. Og.*, 1118.

308. *desdeisi*; cf. 769; *Mac.*, p. x (impf. subj. 2d pl.); *Enf. Og.*, 525 (*deisi*, preterite): the singular for the plural as ordinarily in Northern Italy. The form is due to the influence of the perfect; cf. Parodi in *Arch. glott.*, XV, pp. 24, 26; Lindner, *Plainte de la Vierge*, p. cxxvi.

311. *oltra to maltalent*; cf. *Ber. e Mil.*, 244, n.; *Prise de Pampelune*, 1664, 5435. Cf. here 862, where a correction seems indispensable.

335. I am not sure of the reading of the letters crossed out by the scribe in this verse and in 356, 1239 because I cannot see why they were written in the first place. Is there any significance in the fact that the consonant following in all three cases is *s*? In *Enf. Og.*, 389, Subák reads *n* crossed out before *sofrir*, and in 1068 *li* crossed out before *Sandonio*. *Ti*, *n* and *li* are very similar in our MS and I have no doubt that the same sign confronted Subák. *Ti* seems to me to be the correct reading. Note also that in the two cases cited from *Enf. Og.* the consonant following is *s*. Mussafia does not give corrections of the scribe in the parts of the MS edited by him. In 1779 I read *pi* crossed out and in 1453 *buti* with *ti* crossed out: neither of these cases has, I think, anything to do with the point in question.

341. *mendo* = *amende*; cf. 378 (*mendason*); *Mac.*, gloss. (*mendaça*); Tobler, *Pateg*, Berlin, 1884, p. 20, Salvioni, *Giorn. stor.*, VIII, p. 421, etc. In view of *amendason*, *Mac.*, 3431, it is perhaps safer to read *se mendaça* in *Mac.*, 2806. In his glossary Mussafia refers to *emendaça* 1892 but in the text he reads *vole mendaça*.

353. *Demanes* I left unaccented, thinking that it was Ital. *domani* and

not Old French *demanois*. I have changed my mind. Here and 820 read *demanés*.

Rubrics after 366, 466. *ost*; elsewhere *osto* or *oster*; peculiarity of the writer of the rubrics.

383. *encion* I understand to be a condensation of *entencion*; cf. *entance* 1266 = *entendance* (*intance* in Bertoni, *Attila*, extr. VII, 101, *et passim*), *umo* 1929 (not in rhyme) = *umano* (see note on this verse), *convent Berta*, 137, 500, etc. = *convenient*, *enverés Berta*, 956 = *enverinés* (*velenose*). Similar forms are fairly common in Italian: *leme* (*legume*), Keller, *Barsegapè*, Frauenfeld, 1901, p. 84; *tavia* (*tuttavia*), Parodi, *Trist. ricc.*, p. 433; *desorar*, *reliion*, *vontera*, Seifert, *Glossar zu . . . Bonvesin da Riva*, Berlin, 1886.

389. Perhaps better: *à bon oster e' vo'* (*voglio*) *ma foi palentie*, since *vo* = *VOBIS*, atonic, is a form doubtful in our dialect. Cf. for other dialects Caix, *Origini*, p. 212; d'Ovidio, *Arch. glott.*, IX, p. 77. Correct to *ve*? For similarity of *o* and *e*, see note to 545. For *al* in place of the more common *ai*! see *Berta*, 910, 958. If *vo'* = *voglio*, *palentie* is infinitive.

437. *pré*; the metathesis *pedra* > *preda*, *prea* is very common: see Seifert's *Glossar zu . . . Bonvesin* and his references. The loss of the *a* is due to the rhyme. *Pré* is possible as a plural form. Ulrich, *Raccolta d'Esempi in antico veneziano*, *Romania*, XIII, l. 38 prints *pre[de]* but *pré* should certainly stand, cf. Salvioni, *Giorn. stor.*, XV, p. 257, n. *Pré* seems to be a possible form for the singular in Romagnolo, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. d. Lang. Rom.*, I, § 175 and *Ital. Gram.*, § 37, with the reference to Mussafia's work which I have not been able to consult. Cf. *kamer*, *fnester*, *mnester* mentioned by Malagoli, *Arch. glott.*, XVII, p. 99, and his reference to Toppino. I do not understand the fall of *a* in *prea* in Romagnolo. Malagoli's explanation of *fnester* is not convincing; it could serve with more probability for *pré*. In our text the rhyme accounts for the form.

451. I understand: *En ai* (cf. 94, n.) *repentir* (cf. 1621 n.): *en m'as-tu menacé*. Other interpretations of *an* are not impossible (*anzi* or *anche* or *ancora*) but improbable here. This is the only case of *an* = French *en* INDE in the parts of the MS published. When we find *an* in a Franco-Italian poem we may suppose that that was the form used in the French original as in *Anseis*, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, p. 639: *Mais je lan-n-ay*; *Hector*, *ibid.*, X, p. 395. Or, on account of the frequent use of both forms in French texts, the Italian writer may have considered them interchangeable. This is true, for instance, in the *Farsalia* (ed. Wahle, Marburg, 1888, p. xxv) of Niccolò da Verona and in the *Entrée d'Espagne*, works which are more or less original, not mere transcriptions of French texts. In attempting to ascertain the dialect in which the French original of a Franco-Italian text was written one should remember that the Italian author, unless he is a mere transcriber, is very likely to use forms from various dialects considering them all equally good French (cf. Rajna, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XI, p. 158, n. 1). So in the *Roland* of Venice IV, the fact that *lei* and *loi*, *Karll'* and

Carle are used interchangeably is no evidence as to the date and the dialect of the French original. Keller's assumption (*Die Sprache des venez. Roland* V⁴, Calw, 1884, pp. 22 ff.) that the author of the Venice IV version used two MSS, one Anglo-Norman and the other Continental, is entirely gratuitous. This version is a composite of two versions (O and the Roncevaux version) but the dialects of the MSS used by the author of Venice IV can with difficulty be designated. *An* for *ne* appears also in works purely Italian; see the explanation, not entirely satisfactory, of Bertoni, *Laudario dei Battuti di Modena*, Halle, 1909, p. 84. Parodi (*Romania*, XVIII, p. 594) has explained *sança* (= *senza*) for Florence. This same form appears also in Northern Italy, cf. Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, IX, p. 200; Vidossich, *Tristano veneto*, *Studj romanzi*, IV, p. 80; etc. The same explanation ought to hold for *sança*, *anperço*, etc., in Northern dialects. So *en*, at first only before words beginning with a consonant, might become *an*.

481. *avit* = HABUIT; this form occurs several times in the MS: here, 2055, *Enf. Og.*, 383, *Ber. e Mil.*, 319, where Mussafia changes to *avoit*.

537. *rois de coron* = *rois coroné* 14. This expression occurs everywhere in Italian works of chivalry, and is used popularly even today, cf. Petrocchi, *s.v. corona*. It is used not only of kings but also of princes who will probably wear crowns; that is of royal blood. I do not understand Polidori's note on this expression, *Tavola ritonda*, Bologna, 1864, II, p. 50.

545. *so ben non*; regularly elsewhere in the MS *se ben non*, *se non*. It is not always easy to distinguish *e* and *o*; *se* 560 may be really *so*. *O* final for *e* (so for *se*) is characteristic of Verona (see Mussafia, *Zur Katharinenlegende*, Vienna, 1874, p. 5; Wiese, *Altital. Elementarbuch* §65) but occurs not only there, cf. Bertoni, *Battuti di Modena*, p. 92; Wiese, *Altomb. Marg. Leg.*, pp. cii, cviii and note to v. 515; Wiese, *Zur Margarethenlegende in Abhandlungen* *Tobler* *dargebracht*, Halle, 1895, 129 (*so no*), 128 (*cho no*); Casini, *Legg. di S. Maria Egiz.*, 1179, *Giorn. di Fil. rom.*, III (Franco-Ven.); Novati, *Brendan*, Bergamo, 1892, p. xxx. Parodi corrects *ko voi* and *cho lo* in the *Trist. ricc.* to *che voi*, *che lo*; cf. p. clxii, n.; on the first passage, see *Agg. e Corr.*

551. *cé*; perf. 3 of *çire*, *gire* = *IRE*; cf. Keller, *Barsegapè*, p. 23.

553. *Lion*; Italians were likely to confuse *Laon* and *Lyon* as Guessard remarks, *Macaire*, p. 402; cf. *Roland*, 2910, ed. Stengel: Venice IV has *Lion*, O and the other MSS *Loün*.

559. *sberna*; cf. *squarçar*, *Buovo*, 527 in Rajna, *Ricerche* *Realì di Francia*, Bologna, 1872. *Sbernare* = *sbranare*. The *e* is perhaps due to *bernia* or may be explained phonetically: *sbernare* occurs in Versiglia, cf. Pieri in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XXVIII, p. 163, § 18. Salvioni (*Arch. glott.*, XVI, p. 466) cites *sbrainare* from Lucca and remarks: "preziosa forma che parmi spieghi l'e del vers.," with a reference to the passage in Pieri's work. Cf. also *sbràina* = *frana*, Pieri, *loc. cit.*, gloss. For *ai* > *e* see note to 1666.

577. *sagure* = *sciagura*; *s* = *š* as frequently.

578. *grande siant*; see p. 2.

586. *e[n]fant*; the sign for the nasal is easily omitted from a MS. In the case of this word the nasal is regularly supplied by editors, perhaps unwisely, since the form without it certainly existed. I follow the prevailing custom. The very frequent omission of the nasal has doubtless in some cases a phonetic as well as a paleographic reason. Certain words, e.g., *do(n)jon*, *co(n)roi*, indubitably had two forms. The fact that a consonant is doubled when a nasal is lost (e.g., *maggiare*, Parodi, *Trist. ricc.*, p. cxxxi) shows that the omission is not merely paleographic; cf. Mussafia, *Prise de Pampelune*, p. x; Wahle, *Farsalia*, p. xxvi; Hirsch in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, p. 557; Parodi in *Arch. glott.*, XV, pp. 8, 16 (change of prefix). The questions of assimilation (Latin and Italian) and partial nasalization are to be considered. I have not found an exhaustive study of this subject, which would involve far wider investigations than I have the means to undertake.

670. *smenaventure*; cf. Rajna in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XII, p. 482. Derivation: prosthetic *s* + *meno* + *aventura*, formed under the influence of the corresponding verb. *Menosvenire* is found in Petrocchi; cf. Parodi, *Trist. ricc.*, p. clxiv. Compare *por smenaventure* with the common *perlaventura*, *Panfilo* 19, *Arch. glott.*, X, p. 178; etc. In considering the *smenaven* of Bonvesin, Salvioni (*Giorn. stor.*, VIII, p. 416) cites Milanese *smend* which comes from **ex-minuare*. But **ex-minuare* could not explain *smenaven* which probably comes from *s* + *meno*-(*mis*)- + *venire*, influenced in so far as the *a* is concerned by *aventura*, *smenaventure*. Other data in Seifert, *Glossar zu . . . Bonvesin*, s.v. *smenaven*.

674. *dota*; *doter* = *dotriner*, cf. *Mac.*, gloss.

709. For *aüst* as first person cf. *Mac.*, 186 (MS), 1253 (Mussafia questions the form in his note), 3148; *Enf. Og.*, 1098; *Hector* in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, X, p. 404; *Gui de Nanteuil*, ed. P. Meyer, Paris, 1861, p. 100 (v. 3 of Franco-Ital. text); Bertoni, *Attila*, extr. I, 39.

731. *çoie*; the derivation suggested by Canello in *Arch. glott.*, III, p. 346 (<JOCA), has been generally accepted; see the objections of Tobler in *Pateg*, §19, *Panfilo*, *Arch. glott.*, X., p. 239. The word is masculine in *Pateg* (*çoi*); see *loc. cit.* and p. 46.

Rubric after 796. *Donois*; see note to rubric after 57.

811. *fî*; from *fieri*.

820. See note to 353.

899. *à la mala mort*; *la* ought doubtless to be suppressed, as Rajna suggests in his quotation of this passage in *Romania*, III, p. 53; cf. here, 1047.

920. *vide* = *vita* for *vitanda*.

922. *di* = *due* (cf. *Berta*, 637) or *d'i* = *degli*.

936. *pos e'*; cf. Tobler, *Proverbia* (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX), 185c: '*maistr' eu*'; Tobler, *Panfilo*, 161: *posseu*, 217: *concedeu*. The loss of the ending occurs not infrequently in Northern Italian texts; see Tobler, *Pateg*, p. 35; Bertoni,

Dialecto di Modena, Turin, 1905, §154. For *pose* = *posso*, see Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, XVI, p. 267, but undoubtedly *pos e'* is intended here.

945. *prive* for *privé*; form due to the rhyme.

971. *aïe* = AETATEM; Old French *alé*; form due to the rhyme as *darie* 133; cf. 285. No thought of Old French *aïe* = *aide*, nor of Italian *aidar* = *ajutare* is possible; cf. Rajna, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XI, p. 167, note to *aïter* in vs. 100 of the *Buovo* of Udine and his reference to Ascoli in *Arch. glott.*, II, p. 406. I wonder if the influence of *ajutare* has not been overworked? Cf. *un enfant de petit aïter*, in the passage which Rajna is annotating, with *Roland of Venice* IV, 5699 (ed. Kölbing, Heilbronn, 1877): *Jovene è (d)e de petit aïe*. Is *aïter* anything more than **ater* (cf. the frequent *até*) with the same *i* which appears in *matin*, etc.? The *r* offers difficulty, however. It may be accounted for by the influence of the rhyme.

964. *estoit* = *stat* as frequently.

966. *pré*; Mussafia, *Mac.*, 704, rejects this form and prints *pri*, but *pré* is certainly defensible and occurs besides here and *Mac.*, 704, in *Enf. Og.*, 177.

977. *mois* with *s* crossed out; cf. *mois Aspremont*, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, X, p. 47, §11 = *moi*, = *mon* p. 50, = *mien Anseïs* 437, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, p. 617; *tois Mac.*, 180; *sois Anseïs*, 208. Compare also *lois* LOCUM here 1833, *Mac.*, 666, *Enf. Og.*, 1276, *Berta*, 603; *lois* LEGEM *Enf. Og.*, 425; *fois* FOCUM *Mac.*, 184, 492. Other words in *Aspremont*, *loc. cit.*, p. 47; *Anseïs*, *loc. cit.*, p. 630. Cf. here, 1386, *n*.

986. *s'è*; cf. Salvioni in *Giorn. stor.*, XV, p. 264, §47. On the Venetian *ze* see Gartner in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XXXI, p. 611 ff. *S'è* may be more properly *sè* = **set*: *sum*, **ses*, **set*, *sumus*, **setis*, *sunt*. If *s* of *sum* goes over to **ses* (Ital. *sei*) why not to the other persons with the help of *sumus*, *sunt*, and the pres. subj.? Cf. *siamo* = pres. subj. *Sè*, wrongly understood to be *s'è*, gave rise to *si è*, *io mi sono*, etc.

997. *loi* = *lui*; other examples in *Entrée d'Espagne*, *Bibl. Ecole Chartes*, 1858, p. 221; *Gui de Nanteuil*, p. xxv (last verse of Franco-Ital. text). *Loi* = *lui* is surprising in the face of the *umlaut* characteristic of Northern Italian dialects (cf. Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, I, p. 310, *et passim*; Salvioni, *ibid.*, IX, p. 235; D'Ovidio, *ibid.*, IX, p. 41, n. 3; and his warning, p. 33, n. 3) which brings into existence such pairs as *noi nui*, *voi vui*. These pairs (current not only in the North) along with *lo* = *lu* explain *lui loi*. *Loi* is an indisputable form in Bolognese texts of this period; cf. Salvioni in *Giorn. stor.*, XVI, p. 379, n. *Loi* is starred (**loi*) by D'Ovidio, *op. cit.*, p. 44, n. 4.

1014. *sajeler*; cf. *sagelîer*, *Prise de Pampehune*, 2912, *saçilar*, *Buovo*, 2299 (in Rajna, *Ricerche*), but see *Prise de Pampehune*, p. X. Mussafia himself, however, writes the word with *j* in *Berta*, 1190, 1201.

1039. Correct *creçà-nde* (-*nde* = INDE as frequently)? But the use of the gerund is very broad in Northern Italy; cf. Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, III, p. 273; Novati, *Brendan*, p. liii; etc.

1094. *buçe*; cf. *buzi*, *buzo* Flechia, *Arch. glott.*, VIII, p. 335 (Genoa).

See Pieri in *Studj romanzi*, I, p. 36. *Buçe* occurs in the *Roland of Venice* IV (vs. 2917 of Kölbinger's ed., Stengel, vs. 2729) where the other MSS have some other word. *Buçe* was, therefore, probably not a foreign word to Italian ears.

1153. *Beniant* occurs several times in the MS. *Mussafia*, *Mac.*, 3316, changed to *Belliant* (see his note). The form does not appear in Langlois's *Table des noms propres . . . Chansons de Geste*, Paris, 1904.

1170. *nevo*; in the face of the exceedingly common *nievo* (still alive; cf. Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, I, p. 468, n.) it is unsafe to accent *nevó*.

1178. *del tré Carfaraon*; correct *d'oltre Carfaraon*? But cf. 1191. *Mussafia* prints *li car Faraon* in *Berta*, 202. A similar division is not impossible in the two cases of our text. Cf. *Mussafia's* note.

1188. *qe*; there seems to be no reason to change to *qi* as *Mussafia* does in *Mac.*, 2991, 3419, but not 2270.

nen; MS *non*; see note to 32.

1212. Note the change of rhyme at this verse; cf. *Mac.*, the *laisse* beginning 532 (-er: -é); the *laisse* beginning 2355 (-os: -ors: -ons); *Berta*, the *laisse* beginning 574 (-és: é [one verse: 586]: -er); *Enf. Og.*, the *laisse* beginning 365 (-os: -ors). Cf. Meyer, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX; pp. 620, 624 (*Anseis*). There can hardly be any doubt that the ultimate originals of the poems contained in this MS were in assonance. The Italian compiler bent every effort to reduce the assonances to rhymes, and subsequent scribes (lacunae show that our MS is not the archetype of the Franco-Italian version) certainly seconded such efforts. The monstrous forms found among the rhymes are the result. Probably the original compiler was less guilty than the subsequent scribes who knew little about French, or about assonanced verse, and had the Italian's fondness for rhyme. Single verses violating the rhyme system of the *laisse* are not frequent: *Mac.*, 171 (*avant*: -an), 1845 (*çuçemant*: -an), 2564 (*inperer*: -é); *Berta*, 964 (*falsité*: -és), 1144 (*desmesuré*: -ée), 1377 (*file*: -ie), 1540 (*tere*: -ele, -elle); *Ber. e Mil.*, 416 (*boscher*: -é); *Enf. Og.*, 462 (*Valbrun*: -u). The *m* of the rhyme words in *Berta*, 1338, 1341, *Orl.*, 131, (*entramb*: -ant) is probably the resolution of the abbreviation by the editor. Especial difficulty was encountered in the -ant *laissez*: *Mac.*: *Franç* (5 times), *present* 3334; *Berta*: *Franc* (3 times), *banc* (3 times), *flanc* (twice), *anc* 513, *valan* 995; *Orl.*: *anc* 130; *Enf. Og.*: *Franc* (3 times), *Iovan* 70, *destranç* 537, *Viçanç* 540, *Proanç* 695, *fianç* 934. *Tanp* occurs in -ant *laissez* 8 times (*Mac.*, 3 times, *Berta*, 3, *Ber. e Mil.*, 1, here 1), *canp* 18 times (*Mac.*, 1, *Berta*, 1, *Enf. Og.*, 12, here 4). Even with these words the determined rhymers sometimes found a way. The form *Frant* occurs *Mac.*, 721, *blant*, 1387, *cant*, 2549. In the portion of the MS here published we have the following imperfect rhymes: *file*: -ie 131, *prive*: -ie 945, *tenp*: -ent 888, *tanp*: -ant 1010, *canp*: -ant 1136, 1747, 1977, 2018, *Franc*: -ant 1003, 1148, *blanc*: -ant 1766, 1781. Corrections were necessary in the rhyme words of 388 (cf. *Berta*, 148), 986, 995, 2087.

Many of these rhymes are doubtless intended merely for the eye, but the poet permitted himself the interchange of *-elle, -ele* in *Berta*, 1536 ff., and the rhyme *pensiç: -iz* in *Ber. e Mil.*, 292. When the verses were recited before the populace, the effect produced was surely that of assonance, not of rhyme. Strange rhymes appear not only in Franco-Ital. poems; cf. *Rajna, Romania*, VII, p. 26.

1218. *Adeo*; I correct to *Idio* (*Iddio*). The form with single *d* is registered by Petrocchi. Venetian and Northern Italian dialects generally, prefer single to double consonants, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gram.*, §§ 266, 268; Donati, *Fonetica . . . della Raccolta d'Esempi in antico Venez.*, Halle, 1889, p. 24; Lindner, *Plainte de la Vièrge*, p. lxxxiv.

1312, 1323. *proier* (*proer* 1508) = *prouer*; cf. *roier Mac.*, 910.

Rubric after 1320. The first *i* of *alioit* is not well formed and may be an *l*. *Alioit* could not stand in our text, but cf. *Prise de Pampelune*, p. ix.

1344. The MS here has *fasa mener* and 1658 *fasa menar*, 1242 *fase menar*. I have written in the first two cases *fa s'amener* and *fa s'amenar*; in the last case *fa se menar*. In 1242 I have by mistake printed *mener* in the text.

1376. The difference between *alsient* and *assient* is of course very slight paleographically (cf. *melaçer* for *mesaçer*: rubric after 1069; Mussafia, *Handschriftl. Studien*, p. 310, n.) and perhaps it would be better to correct. *Alsientir* is not an impossibility: influence of the words beginning with *al* = Latin *au-* (*aldire*, etc.).

1386. *par soi enonbrament*; cf. forms cited in note to 977; in addition: *soi, Mac.*, 1237, Graf, *Ugo d'Alvernia, Giorn. di Fil. rom.*, I, p. 101, 6, 17, p. 109, 6; *moi, Mac.*, 1775. On analogy of feminine *moie* a masculine *moi* was formed, whence similar forms for the other possessive pronouns.

1484. *Por preso*, not *porpreso*; common in Ital., e.g., *Rajna, Riv. di Fil. rom.*, I, p. 178, *per presone*. The French probably read *porpris*. Cf. *Enf. Og.*, 346 *l'ont por preson, Mac.*, 2712 *por presoner*.

1497. *smesuré* = *mesuré* with the familiar prosthetic *s*; see Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, I, index I, under *Protesi*. Mussafia corrects, unwisely I think, to *mesuré* in *Mac.*, 964.

1569. *chulvason*; cf. Old French *culvertage*.

1621. *remie*: probably *aramie* with apocope of *a*. Perhaps = *remir* (*Prise de Pampelune*, 187, 1058) with which cf. Old French *remirer* (= *regarder*). *Remie* in *Ber. e Mil.*, 144 = 'remedy,' Old French *remire*. The loss of *r* is not necessarily due to the rhyme (cf. 451 [*repenti*]; Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, XIV, p. 230, § 38, and the references in Wiese, *Altital. Elementarbuch*, p. 100) but the addition of *e* would be so explained: *remire* > *remir* > **remi* > *remie*. I have added *r* in *amo[r]*, 678.

1666. *mé* = Ital. *mai*; cf. Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, XII, p. 413; Mussafia, *Reg. Fra Paolino*, Vienna-Florence, 1868, p. 141; etc. *Mé* = French *mais* here, 383, 614, *Berta*, 1137. *Ai* > *e* over a wide area; cf. references in Wiese,

Altital. Elementarbuch, p. 18; Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, I, p. 432; Vidossich, *Studj romanzi*, IV, p. 78; etc.

vogese; cf. *volse*, 1761 (*vose* = *voluit* *Mac.*, 8, 1446, etc.). The loss of *l* in the group *-ls* is common in a large part of Italy; cf. Lindner, *Plainte de la Vierge*, p. xc; Friedmann, *Altital. Heiligenlegenden*, Dresden, 1908, p. xxx; Rajna in *Riv. di Fil. rom.*, I, p. 170; Bertoni, *Battuti di Modena*, p. xxiv, § 20; Rajna, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XI, p. 171, note to vs. 167 of the *Buovo* of Udine; Gorra, *ibid.*, XIV, p. 148 (Piacenza); etc. Even the advisability of Mussafia's correction *fa[l]sité* (*Berta*, 964) is questionable. *Faso* occurs in Bertoni, *loc. cit.* Cf. 1762, n.

1667. *despaser* = 'open'; cf. *Berta*, 1442.

1677. *docler*; see *Mac.*, gloss., *Berta*, 736, n. The word occurs in Crescini, *Ugo d'Alvernia, Propugnatore*, XIII, II, p. 48.

1697. *Elo l'apelle*; cf. 1752, and *enn oiant*, *Mac.*, 703, 725.

1762. *a[l]tro*; the total loss of *l* in the group *-lt* is peculiarly Ligurian, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gram.*, §§ 99, 236; Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, I, index I, under *-alt*; *ibid.*, II, p. 115; Flechia, *ibid.*, X, p. 151; Parodi, *ibid.*, XV, p. 6; XVI, pp. 123, 338. On the extension to neighboring regions cf. Salvioni, *Arch. glott.*, IX, p. 197, n. (Piedmont); Foerster in *Rom. Stud.*, IV, p. 61 (Gallo-Italic); Bertoni, *Dialecto di Modena*, §113; Gorra, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XIV, p. 148 (Piacenza); and farther south: Crocioni in *Studj romanzi*, III, p. 127. Occasional forms in texts of our region such as *vote* = *volta*, Friedmann, *Altital. Heiligenlegenden*, p. xxx, Lindner, *Plainte de la Vierge*, p. lv (MS Q), *atretal*, *Entrée d'Espagne*, 364, in Thomas, *Nouvelles Recherches sur l'Entr. d'Esp.*, Paris, 1882, p. 61, are to be viewed with suspicion. *Atra* in Monaci's *Crestomazia*, p. 103, vs. 86 (*Pateg*) is perhaps a misprint: cf. ed. Tobler, 192. Cf. note to 1666.

1790. *el*; this form of the article, of frequent occurrence in other texts, appears only here in the parts of MS XIII thus far published; but cf. *.K. el maine* 1376, etc. Unless a mere scribal error this form is important; cf. Mussafia, *Romania*, XXXIV, p. 471.

1819. The MS reading might be retained: *Q'el è*.

1885. *il s'oît davanti soi guardé*; cf. *Mac.*, 714, *si s'a guardé davant*.

1889. On *ensir*, cf. Ascoli, *Arch. glott.*, III, p. 447; Seifert, *Glossar zu . . . Bonvesin*, p. 40; Salvioni, *Studj di Fil. rom.*, VII, p. 238.

1913. *Quant .R. s'en è apercëu* (MS *se ne*); *.R.* is the object of the verb.

Mussafia prints *Mac.*, 1020 as follows: *Quant li parenti Macario se ne aperçeu* (cf. *Berta*, 953, 980, 1419). *Parenti* is the subject and we could write *s'en è* (as I do here) or perhaps better *se n'è*, since the word division of the scribe is not lightly to be tampered with. But there are many cases of the omission of some form of the auxiliary *essere*, usually before the rhyme word; cf. the passages cited above and the far more striking cases, *Berta*, 766 (supply *se sont*), 1598 (*soia*); *Orl.*, 454 (*sont*). Once, at least, in the interior of the verse: *Ber. e Mil.*, 441 (*just.*). Cf. *Buovo* of Udine, 228,

Zeit. f. rom. Phil., XI (supply *s'est*), and Rajna's note; *Roland of Venice* IV, 1390 (*est*), 4418 (*s'est*). Is any importance to be attached to these examples or are they mere accidents? Can a participle thus stand alone? Different word divisions would eliminate some of the difficulties (*s'en è* or *se n'è* instead of *se ne*). In Tobler, *Panfilo* (*Arch. glott.*, X), 90 (p. 183), *ke* may be *k'è* as in our passage *ne=n'è*; cf. *Panfilo*, 148, 711, 719. The construction referred to by Tobler, *Panfilo*, p. 251, and in the glossary under *si qe*, belongs, I think, here. The use of the singular verb for the plural increases the ambiguity. This ambiguity may actually have resulted in the facultative suppression of the auxiliary. Omissions of the verb *essere* in its independent use are usually errors: here, 728, 796; *Enf. Og.*, 519; Laurentian *Buovo* (in Rajna, *Ricerche*), 512; Meyer, *Anseis*, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, 82, 141, 318; *Aspremont*, *ibid.*, X, 173, 423 (cf. p. 54: "zu kurze verse"); *Roland of Venice* IV, 1416. The measure of the verse proves that in many cases the scribe is at fault. The auxiliary *avere* seems to be omitted here, 47 (*apendre*, not *pendre*, is constantly used in our text: cf. 109, 298, 686); cf. 1436, etc.; *Berta*, 62; *Mac.*, 1267, 3225; *Roland of Venice* IV, 1387. So *Panfilo*, 302, *la promessa* [a] or *l'a promessa*. Compare Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I², pp. 102 ff., 248 ff. On the omission of the auxiliary *have* in English, under certain circumstances, see Smith in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, V, p. 346.

1914 ff. Change of person addressed, cf. *Mac.*, 1168 ff.

1929. *umo*; see note to 383. *Umo* may be a scribal error for *umā*.

1998. *treve*; I am not sure of the meaning of this word. It can hardly be *treue=trou*; perhaps=Old French *treuve* (see Godefroy, *s.v.*), possibly=*treive*.

2002. *vidi*, unless an error for *vide*=perfect (is *-i* a possible ending in the 3d sing. for the *-i* perfects as it certainly is for the *-si* perfects?), seems to be present with the not uncommon *-i* ending and *umlaut* from *vedi* to *vidi*, or the form may be due to influence of the perfect stem.

2009. *doti*; the *-i* form seems impossible for a verb of the first conjugation. A correction to *dota* or *dote* is perhaps necessary. But with *-i* of the fourth conjugation in the second person why should the first conjugation not be capable of borrowing *-i* in the third person also, especially when this *-i* appears in all the other conjugations (in the fourth regularly, in the *-ere* verbs sometimes, either phonetically—final *-e*>*-i* in some dialects—or by analogy)? Cf. *doti*, 291, *adori*, 1007.

2067. *staire*; cf. *faire*, 641, 2075, etc.; *ai* for *a*, in *staire* at least, is perhaps merely graphic. But we have a large number of words in which an *i*, so far as I know unexplained, appears before *r*: *coir*, 'heart,' *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, p. 624 (*Anseis*); *foire*, 'fodder,' *ibid.*, X, p. 391 (*Hector*); *fuira*, 'thieving,' *Proverbia* (*ibid.*, IX), 106b, 133b (cf. Seifert, *Glossar zu . . . Bonvesin*, *s.v. fuuro*); *scuiro*, 'obscure,' Keller, *Barsegapè*, p. 18 (see Seifert, *op. cit.*, *s.v. scurio*); etc. Some of the words of this type are usually discussed under the caption of *umlaut*, or influence of an *i* in hiatus.

They may properly be considered in connection with the *mailina*, *puitana* problem. *Luitano* also belongs here. I have seen no satisfactory explanation of these last two classes. It is noteworthy that in almost all these words (in all that I have collected except *speiro*, *Panfilo* [*Arch. glott.*, XI], 6; cf. *spero*, *ibid.*, 5) we have a back vowel followed by a consonant which was pronounced far forward. Was the *-i* originally merely a glide, a link between the back vowel and the consonant? Of course the words in which *umlaut* is apparent are to be separated from the rest. *Speiro*, even, may be due to the second person; so with many verbs, also nouns and adjectives, e.g., *fainti* may explain *fainte*. But *puitana* cannot be so explained.

2071. *Trouan* is to be corrected to *Trojan* (*Troian*). The references to Girardo au Frate in 19, 1108, to Agolan and Helmont in 21 ff., 1055, and here, 2071 seem to indicate that a version of *Aspremont* immediately preceded *Ogier* in the original of our compilation; cf. the sequence in the *Realì*. For *Troian* in *Aspramonte* (seventh book of the *Realì*) see the *titoli* published by Michelant in *Jahrb. f. rom. u. engl. Lit.*, XI, p. 308. Note the mention of Helmont and of the acquisition of Durandarda in the *Orlandino*, 469 ff., which immediately precedes our poem in the compilation.

2083. *asalter* = *exaltare*; cf. Wiese, *Altital. Elementarbuch*, § 34, and Mussafia, *Reg. Fra. Paolino*, p. 141.

2091. Cf. *Mac.*, 396-97 where, I don't know why, the anacoluthon shocked Mussafia to such an extent that he supposed a corruption in the text.

2094. *d'es*; Mussafia, *Mac.*, 3566, n., suggests the correction *del*; cf. *Orl.*, 33, n. *Berta*, 216 reads *ces roman*, 1657 *ste roman*.

2107. On these four sons of Naime (here first counted among the twelve peers and said to have died at Roncevaux) see Thomas, *Nouvelles Recherches sur l'Entr. d'Esp.*, p. 48. In 1161, 1638, the names of the four heroes, in later Italian poems of chivalry constantly named together and in one verse (cf. Rajna, *La Materia del Morgante, Propugnatore*, II, I, p. 244), already appear in the same verse. In MS XIII, *Ive*, *Avolio*, *Belençer*, and *Oton* are nowhere expressly stated to be names of the four sons of Naime. Later tradition (see Thomas and Rajna, *loc. cit.*) has it so. Therefore we may infer that this tradition was current in Italy much earlier, and that our compiler, in speaking of the four sons of Naime, as in this verse, presumed that his audience would have in mind the four heroes mentioned together in 1161, 1638.

In preparing a study of the language of our compilation, the investigator will have a certain number of corrections to make in the parts already published and I have no doubt that he will correct in places the text which I here publish.

The work of Mussafia was done with all the care and competence which that master everywhere displayed. A few inconsistencies will

be easily corrected, e.g., *abes Mac.*, 530, 535, *abés* 533, 537 should be written without the accent; in *vo[i]r Mac.*, 2683, *no[i]se* 2336, 2635, alongside *vor* 1108, 3130, *nosa* 2628, 2713, the MS should be followed; cf. Mussafia's note to *Berta*, 56. So in *tro[i]s Mac.*, 796, 1966; cf. here 1624, 1635. Cf. also my note to 1188. I have suggested a few corrections to Mussafia's editions in my notes. Here are a few more (all for *Macaire*) which I offer for what they are worth:

23. Keep the MS reading: *s'aïmes: se=ci* (cf. p. xiv).

94. *adester* (MS) might be kept; cf. 1319.

226. *di'car* is doubtless a misprint for *dicar* (*diçar*).

227. *à ler*; on p. v the editor insists upon this reading. Though the author is capable of such a barbarism as *ler* for *le* in the rhyme, *aler* would be satisfactory (cf. 242).

731. *darer* not *d'arer*.

901, note. *voit=volet*, questioned by Mussafia, occurs in *Orl.*, 265 and perhaps here 136 (may=*vadit*): an analogical form, cf. *oit*, *poit*, *soit* SAPIT, *doit* DAT, 517.

1047. *no[-l]*, supplying the pronoun (?). There is a strong tendency to drop a final *l* in our MS; see Mussafia's note to 600 and my note to 294.

1529. note. With *posoit*, which Mussafia rejects, cf. *stasoit* STABAT in *Berta*, 1044, 1165.

3362. End quotation here.

Subák's edition of the *Enf. Og.* betrays some haste in composition. The editor would certainly have avoided some serious errors if he had read more carefully the portions of the MS previously published. I offer the following suggestions:

46. Difficult; perhaps: *Ne an que l' posa la tera defenser.*

152, 203, etc. *Çofre* not *Çofrè*.

208, 319. *à verdi heumi* not *aver di heumi*.

220. Read *trois (tresque) en Valange*.

237. Keep the MS reading: *devè=devaient*.

262. *abrivè* not *abrinè*.

359. Period should be at end of 359 not 360.

363. Read *exploitè*.

439. *como* is probably a scribal error; cf. *Mac.*, 2821, where Mussafia rightly corrects.

495. *Tant ò in Dè* not *oi 'nde*.

525. *deisi* not *deisi*.

564. Read: *Anch è 'lo li Danois e li vestre scuè!*

676. *El è* not *E l'è*; cf. my note to 168.

713. Read *e* not *è*, and suppress the period at the end of the verse.

778, 860. *lo'* not *lo[i]*; cf. *Berta*, 56, n.

780. *colsa como no* not *colsa c'omo no*.

828. *veçando* (= *vezando*, *vetando*) not *ueçando*; cf. Keller, *Barsegapè*, 1750-51.

930. It seems necessary to correct *o* to *e*; cf. my note on rubric after 57, remark on *Dainos*, *Enf. Og.*, 531.

1166. Read *la o* or *lao*, certainly without the comma.

1187. *d'aquinton* not *da quinton*.

1276. Read *enmelois* or *en melois*; cf. my note to 977.

Subák's footnotes seem to show that he has read the MS of the *Enf. Og.* with great care, and that he presents with accuracy all the variants. One thing, however, is surprising: in all other parts of the MS, the scribe carefully distinguishes French *qi*, etc., from Ital. *qui*, etc., writing almost invariably *q-* for the French words and *qu-* for the Ital. (cf. above, p. 2). No trace of this distinction is observable in the *Enf. Og.*, where we have always *qu-*. It seems impossible that the editor be not here at fault.

BARRY CERF

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN